

**Minutes of:** CALIFORNIA STATE ATHLETIC COMMISSION  
**Meeting Specifics:** Regular Commission Meeting  
June 13, 2003 – 9:00 a.m.  
The De La Hoya Youth Center  
1114 South Lorena  
Los Angeles, CA 90023

**1. CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIRMAN**

Commissioners Present: Van Gordon Sauter, Chairman  
Armando Vergara  
Christopher Mears  
Sanford Michelman, Vice-Chairman  
John Frierson

Commissioner Absent: Al Ducheny

Staff Present: Rob Lynch, Executive Officer  
Dean Lohuis, Chief Athletic Inspector  
Earl Plowman, Deputy Attorney General  
Anita Scuri, DCA Legal Counsel  
Jessica Finch, Recording Secretary

(The items were heard in the following order: 1-2-4-4-3-17-5.1-5.2-6.5-6.1-6.3-6.3.2-5.3-11-9-8-15-14-13)

**2. APPROVAL OF MAY 15, 2003 COMMISSION SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING RECOMMENDATIONS - ACTION**

**Action:** Motion by Commissioner Mears and seconded by Commissioner Vergara to approve the May 15, 2003 sub-committee meeting minutes as submitted and the recommendations contained in those minutes including: Approval of March 26 ,2003 minutes, Approval of August 14, 2003 meeting date, Denial of promoter's license of RSB Entertainment, Approval of promoter's license for Platinum Promotions and Main Events.

**Vote:** Unanimous.

**3. SUMMARY OF CHAIRMAN ACTIVITIES SINCE LAST MEETING**

Chairman Sauter did not have any activities to report.

**4. SUMMARY OF EXECUTIVE OFFICER ACTIVITIES SINCE LAST MEETING**

Mr. Lynch stated that before the next meeting the Commissioners will be presented with a Sunset Review Report. He explained that every four years the Athletic Commission must justify itself to the legislature. He added that the Commission may face an additional 10% personal services cut along with all the State Agencies and will have more information at the next meeting.

Commissioner Mears then asked if the budget is not passed on time, what would the effect on the Athletic Commission be. Mr. Lynch responded that the Commission would move forward and the vendors would have to wait for payment.

Mr. Lynch then informed the Commission of the date and time of the Lewis vs. Klitscho bout press conference and stated that actual bout would be on June 21, 2003 live on HBO. Mr. Lohuis then asked if one of the Commissioners could attend and do the official weigh-in of the main event. Chairman Sauter stated that he was unable to attend, Vice-Chairman Michelman volunteered to attend and would be honored to do the weigh-in.

## **5. LICENSING APPROVALS – NEW APPLICATIONS - ACTION**

### **5.1 Inocencio Madera – dba The Bakersfield Dome – Amateur Boxing Promoter – Original**

Mr. Lynch informed the Commission that Mr. Madera is applying for an original 2003 amateur boxing promoter license. Mr. Madera met all of the licensing requirements and was issued a temporary promoter license on April 7, 2003. The initial event was held on May 17, 2003 at the Bakersfield Dome. The show featured ten amateur elimination tournament bouts. All participants fought only one bout that day. Staff experienced no unusual problems at this event. Mr. Lynch further stated that the staff recommends that Mr. Madera be granted a 2003 amateur boxing promoter license.

**Action:** Motion by Commissioner Vergara and seconded by Commissioner Mears to grant The Bakersfield Dome a 2003 amateur boxing promoter permanent license.

**Vote:** Unanimous.

### **5.2 Frederick O. Lewis III – dba Big Time World Championship Boxing – Professional Boxing Promoter – Original**

Mr. Lewis did not attend.

### **5.3 Gregory Davidson and Samuel Martin Jr. – dba Top Shelf Entertainment – Amateur Boxing Promoter - Original**

Mr. Lynch informed the Commission that Messrs. Davidson and Martin are applying for an original 2003 amateur boxing promoter license. Top Shelf Entertainment met all of the licensing requirements and was issued a temporary promoter license on May 1, 2003. Their first event was held on June 1, 2003 at the Burbank Hilton. While the event was not a financial success, there were no serious injuries and staff experienced no unusual problems. Staff recommends that Top Shelf Entertainment be granted a 2003 amateur boxing promoter license. Ms. Scuri asked that Mr. Martin amend the application to reflect all partners.

**Action:** Motion by Commissioner Mears and seconded by Commissioner Frierson to approve Top Shelf Entertainment for a permanent amateur boxing promoter license upon receipt of amended application.

**Vote:** Unanimous.

## **6. COMMITTEE REPORTS – INFORMATION / ACTION**

### **6.1 Arbitration Committee Report**

Mr. Plowman stated that there is one arbitration scheduled at this time, but he had just received additional requests for arbitration and will be reviewing the paperwork.

### **6.2 Pension Plan Review Committee Report**

Vice-Chairman Michelman informed the Commission that he was in receipt of information regarding the pension plan and is in the process of reviewing it at this time. He added that he would have a report at the next meeting.

Chairman Sauter then stated that he had met with an attorney who has interest in the boxers' pension plan and suggested that Vice-Chairman Michelman meet with this gentleman to discuss the pension plan.

### **6.3 Medical and Safety Standards Advisory Committee Report**

- Dr. Paul Wallace informed the Commission that he has concern as to the number of upcoming events. He stated that it was his belief that there is a lack of physicians in several pockets of California. He explained that with the amount of time that it takes, the issues of liability and malpractice insurance and the compensation, it has become difficult to recruit and more difficult to retain physicians. He stated that it is also his belief that the duties and responsibilities of the Chair of the Medical Advisory Committee are none but he views it as his duty as an overseer of the physicians.
- He explained that recently he had received a phone call regarding an injured fighter. He further explained that at the time of the event there were two ringside physicians present and there was a disagreement as to whether or not the fighter should be sent to the hospital. He stated that the fighter did not go that evening but due to his condition was taken in the next day. He informed the Commission that the fighter had sustained a concussion. Dr. Wallace went on to say that the situation was disturbing to him as a physician. He explained that after the fighter was knocked out, the cornerman pulled the fighter back into the ring by his feet and then the doctors entered the ring. He stated that the boxer was evaluated in the ring and then taken in the back and evaluated again and once more approximately an hour and a half later and sent home.

Dr. Wallace stated that he feels that there is an increasing amount of pressure from the promoters and staff to have the physician consider the financial repercussions of an evaluation. Mr. Plowman stated that it was his understanding that at this particular situation that there were two physicians

and a Paramedic and an Emergency Medical Technician (EMT). Mr. Plowman elaborated that it was also his understanding that all were in agreement that the fighter did not need to be transported. He then asked if the ringside physicians had submitted a written report. Dr. Wallace stated that they had not. Dr. Wallace stated that he feels the problem was that there was no one to “make a decision”. He stated that if there was a Medical Director as in other states, then a final decision could have come from the Medical Director.

Chairman Sauter then asked what Dr. Wallace was asking the Commission to consider. He asked if the issues at hand were 1) the role of the various Commission representatives at an event and 2) what is the process when two doctors disagree. Dr. Wallace agreed that the two issues Chairman Sauter mentioned are his concern. He added that the role and responsibility of the physician’s at ringside are not well defined. He asked the Commission to consider a protocol as to what to do when an emergency happens and who is to be called and who has the final decision.

- Commissioner Mears then asked what authority the two ringside physicians have in requiring the fighter to have medical attention. Ms. Scuri stated that under California law you cannot require that someone receive medical treatment but you can inform the person of all of his or her options. Dr. Wallace stated that the problem was that there is no protocol for emergencies and what to do when there is indecision. Vice-Chairman Michelman stated that once the physicians have informed the fighter it is ultimately the fighter’s choice to go or not. Commissioner Mears then asked if the Commission could require the fighters to comply with any medical order as a condition of licensure. Mr. Plowman stated that questions regarding a person’s Constitutional Rights come into play with that type of requirement.
- Chairman Sauter then asked Mr. Lynch, Mr. Plowman, Commissioner Frierson and Dr. Wallace to confer by conference call and discuss the process of what to do in an emergency or when there is indecision and what authority the Commission has. Vice-Chairman Michelman added that a memorandum should be sent out stating that if there is a disagreement with the physicians that the avenue taken be that of caution.
- Chuck Hassett, a licensed judge, addressed the issue of the cornerman pulling the fighter into the ring by his feet. He stated that the cornerman should not have interacted with the injured fighter until the ringside physician has given the authority to do so. He explained that the referee should have advised the cornerman not to touch the fighter until the physician has released him or her and the referee should have stayed next to the fighter until the physician arrived in the ring. He further explained that this was the process that was agreed upon by the ringside physicians and the referees. He added that subsequent to turning the fighter over to the physician, the referee has the

responsibility to function as a “policeman” to keep the cornerman away while the physician attends the fighter.

- Chairman Sauter then asked for this issue as to the protocol to be placed on the next meeting agenda with written positions from all parties to be submitted to the Commission well before the next meeting in order to disseminate the information to the Commissioners.
- Chairman Sauter then asked Mr. Lynch when the next physicians clinic would be. Mr. Lynch stated that if the Commission approved, he would like to conduct a clinic before the next Commission meeting. Chairman Sauter replied that the Commission would agree to his suggestion.
- Dr. Wallace then suggested that the physicians be evaluated just as the referees are evaluated. Chairman Sauter stated that initiation of some type of evaluation could be implemented and asked Dr. Wallace to prepare a written process of evaluation and submit it to the staff so that that staff could disseminate it to the Commissioners well in advance of the next Commission meeting.
- Dr. Wallace stated that there have been problems with promoters stating that they are unaware of the ambulance requirement for each event. Mr. Lynch stated that a memorandum was sent to all amateur and professional promoters reminding them of all of the promoter responsibilities and the ambulance requirement.

6.3.1 Ringside Physician Pay  
This item was not heard.

6.3.2 Amateur Martial Arts Fighters – Blood tests vs. Headgear  
Dr. Wallace informed the Commission that it is his opinion that if blood tests for amateur martial arts fighters could not be done, then he would like to see all amateur martial arts fighters required to wear headgear. Ms. Scuri replied that regulation would need to be changed. Vice-Chairman Michelman stated that he would be in favor of blood testing being required. Chairman Sauter then asked what the consensus of the amateur fighters may be. Dr. Wallace stated that most of that particular type of fighter would not want to wear any type of headgear or protective equipment. Mr. Lynch stated that he agreed with the preference of the requirement of blood tests. Chairman Sauter stated that the legislative route would seem the most beneficial for the fighters and the Athletic Commission. Ms. Scuri replied that if that is what the Commission would like to do then legislation would need to be drafted and an author would need to be found to support the legislation.

**Action:** Motion by Commissioner Mears and seconded by Vice-Chairman Michelman to have Ms. Scuri to prepare draft legislation to require amateur martial arts fighters

to submit a negative HIV, Hepatitis B Surface Antigen and Hepatitis C result as a condition of licensure.

**Vote:** Unanimous.

6.4 Officials Committee Report

6.5 Amateur Boxing Committee Report

Commissioner Vergara stated that he had just returned from the Nationals in Las Vegas, Nevada. He informed the Commission that during this tournament, 300 fighters participated and California had two champions. He added that those two will be going on to the trials for the Olympics. Commissioner Vergara introduced a coach named Dennis Heffner to speak. Mr. Heffner stated that the venue in Las Vegas was beautiful (The Orleans). He explained that a movie was being filmed during the tournament and many of the fighters were able to participate as extras in the film. He informed the Commission that California brought 11 fighters with 4 going to the semi-finals and 2 to the finals. He further added that one fighter was 106 lbs. (Suarez) from Ventura and the other was 119 lbs. (Ramos) from Sacramento.

Chairman Sauter then congratulated both Commissioner Vergara and Coach Heffner on a job well done and further stated that the Commission appreciates all of their efforts and he knows that they take pride in the success of all the young people participating especially those two who are going forward.

**7. PROFESSIONAL / AMATEUR BOXER / MARTIAL ARTS FIGHTER  
MEDICAL INSURANCE - ACTION**

This item was not heard.

**8. AMATEUR BOXING EVENTS – INFORMATION / ACTION**

Mr. Lynch stated that since the Commission's approval of amateur boxing events some concerns have arisen regarding these events. Some of these concerns regard the number of times participants may participate in any one tournament and the training, or lack thereof, of the participants. He explained that Commissioner Mears requested that this item be placed on the agenda for discussion with our licensed amateur promoters. All of the licensed amateur promoters who promote these types of events have received a notice of invitation to participate in discussing the Commission's concerns. Mr. Sam Martin, Top Shelf Entertainment, Incencio Madera, The Bakersfield Dome, Steve Coppler, Toughman Promotions were all in attendance.

Commissioner Mears stated that his concern in bringing this matter on agenda is that Dr. Wallace had stated serious concerns as to the cooperation of the promoters with the rules of the Commission in regards to amateur boxing. He also mentioned the strain it was placing on the physicians according Dr. Wallace to attend these events with so many bouts scheduled. He explained that the health and safety of the participants is what is of grave concern to himself personally as well as the Commission as a whole.

Mr. Lynch stated that at the last Commission Sub-Committee meeting he discussed how he was under the impression that a participant could compete twice in one night but it was clarified that a participant could only compete three times in a two day tournament. He explained that a memorandum was sent to all amateur boxing promoters clarifying the rules for amateur boxing. He further added that the events that he had attended were strictly amateur bouts with little or no talent and that he had not seen anyone “taken out of the stands” to compete. Mr. Lynch went on to say that the participants wear 16 ounce gloves and headgear and that no one over the age of 36 is allowed to compete. He added that generally the fighter is tired after the first round and the crowd seems to like it.

Dr. Wallace stated that the physical conditioning is usually poor and the physician usually speaks with the referee before the bout to inform the referee to watch for a clear mismatch in ability (military personnel vs. bar bouncer). He added that having a one minute round is a benefit in terms of safety. He explained that if the rules are followed and no substitutions are made, then he has no concerns. He stated that if a participant is “taken out of the crowd” that person may be equally talented, but may have consumed alcohol that evening. Dr. Wallace stated that although it is impossible to verify the participants actual training, he feels staff should have a process to evaluate the participants. He elaborated that the clearance to participate by the physician is not only based on the physical form. He stated that there are times when information is given to the physician through a third party regarding a possible medical condition that would preclude a person from competing. He stated that he would like the Commission to publicly state that the physicians have the authority to not approve a participant if the physician feels that it is medically inadvisable. Dr. Wallace then informed the Commission with the influx of these types of events; the participants are often participating in bouts a week apart.

Commissioner Mears then thanked the three amateur promoters who did attend and then advised them that the Commission is keeping a close watch on amateur boxing. Chairman Sauter then asked Dr. Wallace to articulate his concerns on amateur boxing (time period between bouts, etc.) and the responsibility of the ringside physician at these type of bouts and would like to discuss this at the next Commission meeting.

Chairman Sauter then asked the amateur promoters in attendance if they would like to speak. Mr. Samuel Martin, Top Shelf Entertainment, stated that he and his partner are in agreement with having the participants submit all paperwork beforehand to the Commission. He added that he had absolutely no problem with any ringside physician determining that any participant is not “fit to fight”. He explained that his concern first and foremost in the health and safety of all of the participants and the fans are secondary. Mr. Lynch stated that unknown to Mr. Martin; staff had spotted four experienced amateur fighters prior to competing in his event and did not allow them to participate.

Mr. Incencio Madera, The Bakersfield Dome, informed the Commission that amateur boxing is a benefit to California. He explained that he is involved in a training facility that had 60 individuals that wanted to participate in his event, but only 20 were chosen. He further explained that out of the 20 chosen, 4 were training to be professional fighters. He informed the Commission that there were applicants from USA Boxing, Inc. that wanted to participate but were told by USA Boxing that if they participated in his event, they would lose their status in

USA Boxing, Inc. He stated that if the Commission wanted experienced amateurs, then some type of agreement would need to be made with USA Boxing. He further stated that the Athletic Commission oversees USA Boxing and it seems unfair to not allow the fighters who wish to participate to compete. Commissioner Vergara then asked if Mr. Madera was licensed through USA Boxing. Mr. Madera replied that he was licensed through them also but USA Boxing does not let its members participate in any other program unless sanctioned by USA Boxing. Mr. Denkin stated that regulation states that all types of boxing is regulated by the Athletic Commission, but the Athletic Commission delegated the authority of amateur boxing to USA Boxing, Inc. He explained to the Commission that if the fighter wants to participate in a California State Athletic Commission event and USA Boxing is not allowing them to, it is superceding the authority of the Commission. He feels that this is a detriment to those who want to participate in both.

Mr. Steve Coppler, Toughman Promotions, stated that if a ringside physician states that a fighter cannot participate he and his company have no problem with that decision. He stated that in conjunction with being concerned that a fighter may not have enough skill, there should be a concern that a fighter has too much skill. He explained that Toughman was built for someone with little or no skills. He added that in his promotions if a fighter wins the local market, he is allowed to defend his "title" once and if he wins he cannot participate again. He explained that is how the skill level is controlled in his promotions.

Mr. Madera stated that in his promotion he only allows a fighter one fight per event and no more than five fights total.

Chairman Sauter then stated that although the Commission is comfortable with the current promotions, but is very cautious and will be keeping a close watch on the promotions.

Commissioner Mears then asked if the Commission has the jurisdiction to inform USA Boxing to eliminate their rule regarding competing. Mr. Lynch stated that the Commission has full jurisdiction over amateur boxing. Commissioner Vergara stated that he was unaware of this situation and would like to discuss it further. Commissioner Mears agreed that he would like a representative from USA Boxing, Inc. to attend the next meeting to discuss this issue.

Mr. Jack Reiss, a licensed referee, stated that he has concerns with the amateur boxing promoters in complying with the rules of the Commission and the lack of attention given to structure by the amateur promoters. Chairman Sauter then asked Mr. Reiss to submit a written report regarding this issue and submit it to the Commission for review.

## **9. OFFICIAL EVALUATIONS – INFORMATION / ACTION**

Chairman Sauter informed the Commission stated that a meeting was held the day prior to discuss a process for evaluations in which Commissioner Frierson, Earl Plowman and Rob Lynch were all in attendance.

Mr. Plowman stated that the process being presented outlined in the following memo:



## **Memorandum**

**To: Commissioners**

**From: Earl Plowman**

**Subject: Recommendations For Action on Master Official Program**

On June 12, 2003 Chairman Sauter, Commissioner Frierson, Executive Officer Rob Lynch and I met with Martin Denkin, Pat Russell, and Chuck Hassett to review the agenda items left for discussion on the creation and implementation of an experimental program to satisfy the statutory mandate that all referees assigned to bout within California are to have their performance monitored.

Master Officials will also provide input into a ranking system covering all licensed referees in California to ensure that a referee with an appropriate degree of skill is assigned to all bouts in this State. Based upon the consensus of the parties, the following parameters are suggested to the Commissioners for approval.

### **I. Qualification and Selection of Master Officials**

Master Officials shall have had not less than 10 years of experience as a licensed referee within California with no prior record of disciplinary action before the Commission.

Master Officials shall be selected by the Executive Officer from the ranks of qualified officials. Officials may volunteer their names and other officials may suggest other persons. The initial number of Master Officials shall be 6 or 7, to be divided between Northern and Southern California.

Master Officials shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission, with not set length of time for service. Officials agreeing to serve in this capacity are requested to commit to at least a year of service to assure continuity of officials.

Master Officials will retain their licenses and may referee in other States and countries but agree that they will not referee in California or on tribal land in California while serving as a Master Official.

### **II. Assignment of Master Officials**

Master Officials will be assigned by staff on a rotating basis. It is anticipated that initially the Master Officials will also serve as judges at some fights on a card and as reviewers on other fights. More than one Master Official may be assigned depending upon availability.

### **III. Conflicts of Interest and Recusal**

Master Officials may not review the performance of referees on any card where an assigned referee is related to the Master Official by blood or marriage. Master Officials must disclose any such relationship so that in assigning officials for review, staff can avoid any such conflicts. In the event that through error or necessity a Master Official shall not review his or her relative, and the other officials being reviewed must consent to the Master Official reviewing their performance at a show where the reviewer's relative is also an official.

A Master Official may recuse himself or herself at any time from reviewing any other referee without stating any reason for so doing. The Executive Officer will honor this request unless it is absolutely necessary due to illness or unavailability of other Master Officials.

### **IV. Frequency of Review and Length of Program**

The law mandates that every referee is supposed to be reviewed each time he or she referees. This has not been honored due to personnel limitations. The initial intention is to review every referee at every show to create a baseline and gain experience. Depending upon experience, the number of reviews may be decreased. This experimental program is scheduled to last for a period of one year with a review after 6 months and a general report to the Commissioners at 6 months and one year.

### **V. The Review Process**

The Commission has a target date of September 1, 2003 for the start of this program. Initially Master Officials will perform reviews using the same approved forms last used by Larry Rozadilla, which provide categories of things to be evaluated. Recognizing that refereeing is both a dynamic art and a science, the Master Officials will pay close attention to not only the mechanics of refereeing, but also the overall control of the bout to assure boxer safety.

The Master Officials will also note the degree of difficulty of the bout and the relative level of skill shown by the referee in his or her handling of the bout.

The Master Officials may receive and note input from other officials and Commission personnel on the performance of referees, but the evaluation and rating of the referee is their responsibility. They are expected to discuss their observations with the referee being evaluated as well as file a written report with the Executive Officer.

The Master Official will also note general areas of refereeing that will be addressed in upcoming referee clinics and provide input to the ranking system that the referees have requested. This will in turn assist the staff in balancing assignments consistent with the abilities of the official and the difficulty of the bout for which an assignment is to be made.

#### **VI. Uniformity and Consistency**

The goal of the Master Official Program is to develop and maintain the professional skills of California's referees. To do this, the Master Officials from both Northern and Southern California will meet on a regular basis to review each other's evaluations. Steps will be taken to ensure that there is uniformity in the review process. To achieve this, the Master Officials will view taped bouts from throughout the State and the reviews done of these bouts. They will also review materials from other States and countries, as well as training and rating material from ABC and various sanctioning organizations.

#### **VII. Notification of All Referees**

The Executive Officer will send a Notice to all licensed referees advising them of the implementation of the Master Official program and explaining how it will be implemented. It is anticipated that at some point during the implementation of this program, and after a year, the referees will be asked to provide input and suggestions on the program.

Mr. Plowman then stated that there had been discussion with Chairman Sauter and Commissioner Frierson and it was agreed that all Master Officials would be qualified as interim intermittent civil service employees and be on the State payroll. He stated at this time it was dubious, but it is a goal for the future.

He explained that the rating system will have 3 categories: A, B and C. An "A" official would be complete journeyman, "B" official would have the ability to referee most bouts and a "C" official would be considered 'in training'.

He added that the hope is that official's clinics will be more informative with this new process with a more unified front.

Mr. Plowman then informed the Commission that the current evaluation forms will be used in the beginning and once a determination has been made either way, it will be brought before the Commission.

Chairman Sauter stated that it was his belief that a head of the Master Officials should be made and Mr. Chuck Hassett was in agreement. As to what title this person would have is to be determined. It was the Chairman's suggestion that after three months of this experimentation that a head of some sort be named. Mr. Hassett strongly urged the Commission to appoint a leader, whomever the Commission would choose. Mr. Plowman reminded the Commission that the Master Officials would report directly to the Executive Officer. Commissioner Mears then asked what the opposition was to having a leader of the Program. Mr. Pat Russell stated that this will be a process and that after the 6 or 7 people are named and appointed and once they have worked together, they will come up with whom they wish to represent them as a spokesperson. He stated that it would be premature to appoint a leader at this time. Commissioner Mears then asked how long it would take the Master Officials to come up with a leader. Mr. Russell replied that it would be discussed at the first meeting of the Master Officials. Chairman Sauter agreed that the Officials should come to the Commission and present who they would like to represent them as a whole. Commissioner Mears stated that he was also comfortable with that decision.

Chairman Sauter then thanked Mr. Pat Russell for all of his efforts and support during the entire creation and discussion of the Master Officials Program.

**Action:** Motion by Commissioner Vergara and seconded by Commissioner Mears to recommend that the Commission implement the outlined Master Officials Program.

**Vote:** Unanimous.

#### **10. RINGSIDE PHYSICIAN CLINICS – INFORMATION / ACTION**

This item was covered under Item 6.3.

#### **11. CALIFORNIA REFEREES ASSOCIATION - INFORMATION**

Mr. Martin Denkin, President of the California Referees' Association, informed the Commission that this Association also includes physicians and timekeepers. He stated that the officials are the backbone of the Commission. He explained that the Association has been around for 50 years, and that although the Commissioners, Executive Officers, and staff may come and go the same officials remain. He stated that the Association will be working in hand with the evaluation system in order to improve all officials. He also stated that he hopes the Association will be a liaison between staff and the officials.

Mr. Denkin stated that the Association would like to request a seat on the dais for the representation of the officials. He stated just as Dr. Paul Wallace represents the Medical Advisory Committee, the Referees' Association would like to be recognized and represented. Chairman Sauter stated that Commission will discuss the request for a seat and will respond.

#### **12. PROMOTER EVENT CHECKLIST – INFORMATION / ACTION**

This item was not heard.

### **13. LENGTH OF SUSPENSIONS – CALIFORNIA vs. OTHER STATES INFORMATION / ACTION**

Mr. Lynch stated that at the January 2003 Commission meeting, the topic of California suspensions versus those for other states was discussed. A California suspension for a knockout is a minimum of 45/30. This means the boxer may not be in a bout for 45 days and he cannot spar for a minimum of 30 days. The discussion centered around whether or not the California 45/30 could be imposed on a boxer if that boxer was knocked out in another jurisdiction and suspended for less than 45/30. Staff was instructed to prepare regulatory draft language which would permit the imposition of California's 45/30 day suspension on boxers who are knocked out in other jurisdictions and are given a less than 45/30 day suspension. If the Commission adopts the proposed regulations, staff will set the regulations for public hearing. Ms. Scuri suggested that September 18, 2003 could be the hearing date.

**Action:** Motion by Commissioner Mears and seconded by Vice-Chairman Michelman to set the proposed regulation regarding the length of suspensions for hearing.

**Vote:** Unanimous.

### **14. PROMOTER FINANCIAL STATEMENTS – INFORMATION / ACTION**

Mr. Lynch stated that staff is requesting Commission guidance on the subject of promoter financial statements. The main question is should there be a minimum dollar or net worth that a promoter should have before he or she can be deemed responsible enough to promote. Also, should there be a minimum level of financial responsibility for amateur vs. professional promotions? Mr. Lynch addressed this with other commissions and they have no specific criteria, which must be met. All of the commissions seem satisfied if a prospective promoter can meet the bonding requirements.

Vice-Chairman Michelman then asked what the goal of the financial statement was. Mr. Plowman explained that it is to find out where and to what extent the prospective promoter is associated financially. Vice-Chairman Michelman then asked why this was a concern. Ms. Scuri replied that when this requirement was enacted there was a major concern with organized crime and their association in boxing.

Chairman Sauter then asked what the needs of the Commission currently are. Mr. Roy Englebrecht stated that in his opinion that the Commission is "selling" a "professional sport franchise" without a structured criteria regarding their knowledge of boxing. He added that a promoter clinic should be required for prospective promoters prior to approval of a temporary license. He went on to mention that promoters should be required to attend a certain amount of meetings in order to maintain their license.

Vice-Chairman Michelman stated that pursuant to regulation there is no specific criteria regarding financial statement. Ms. Scuri stated that Business and Professions Code 18665 states in part, "...any person connected with, or having a proprietary interest in, an applicant for a promoter's license shall provide the commission with such financial information, or access to

such financial information, as the commission deems necessary in order to determine whether the applicant is financially responsible...” Chairman Sauter then suggested that staff come back with a written suggestion of what the requirement should be and present it to the Commission at the next meeting. He added that perhaps some type of promoter clinic should be developed and asked if Mr. Englebrecht would discuss with Mr. Lynch what such a class would consist of and who would be in charge of the class.

Commissioner Mears also agreed that promoters should be required to attend some meetings as a requirement to maintain a license.

**15. COMMISSION RULES 217 & 218 – WRITTEN EXAMINATION AS  
CONDITION OF LICENSURE – MATCHMAKER / MANAGER / SECOND /  
TIMEKEEPER – INFORMATION / ACTION**

Mr. Lynch stated that Commission Rules 217 and 218 require that all original applicants for licensure as a matchmaker, manager, second and timekeeper pass a written examination administered by the Commission. He and Ms. Scuri met with Tracey Farrell, Chief of the Examination Resources Office. Dr. Farrell was interested in completing an occupational analysis of the Commission’s examination process. Mr. Lynch informed Dr. Farrell that the Commission had not administered these written examinations as long as he had been with the Commission (1982). It was suggested that the regulations be amended to delete these requirements. It is not practical for staff to administer written examinations due to staffing concerns and the fact that many of the original applications are received at a weigh-in and many weigh-ins are on the verge of Bedlam.

Mr. Lynch informed the Commission that it is the staff’s recommendation that the regulations be amended to reflect that the Commission may give an examination rather than the applicant shall pass an examination. This gives the Commission flexibility and the entire examination process will not be lost forever.

Ms. Scuri indicated that the Office of Administrative Law would not approve such a regulation. Mr. Denkin agreed that the requirement is useless at this point. Chairman Sauter stated that he is in agreement with having rules that are not enforced.

Chairman Sauter then suggested that Vice-Chairman Michelman discusses this issue with staff and bring the item back at a future Commission meeting.

**Action:** No action was taken.

**Vote:** No vote was taken.

**16. AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

- Judge Evaluations
- Athletic Commission Funding
- Protocol At An Event In An Emergency

- Physician Evaluations
- Ability Of Referees To Impose Suspension For Hard Fight
- Funding For Master Officials
- Dr. Wallace's Concerns For Amateur Boxing
- CSAC and USA Boxing, Inc. Relationship
- Promoter Financial Statements
- Promoter Clinics
- Criteria for Technical Knockout/Knockout/Hard Fight

## **17. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS**

Chairman Sauter commented that discussion has been made in regards to evaluation of judges. He stated that this is an area in which he would like to see more discussion but that this should be done after the referee evaluation process has been achieved.

Chairman Sauter then informed the Commission that discussion regarding the Athletic Commission's funding needs to be made. He explained that although boxing is currently thriving, the Commission would need to look at the long term picture. He added that perhaps the Commission may want to consider being self sufficient considering the current budget crisis within the State.

Mr. Dean Lohuis stated that there are currently 25 events scheduled for July. Chairman Sauter explained that although there is a tremendous amount of activity, there is an incredibly limited staff that is currently spread too thin as it is. He added that there are other issues that needed the Commission's attention but may be difficult with the current staffing issues and the budget issues.

At that time, Chairman Sauter then informed the Commission that he would limit his term as Chairman to two years and asked the Commissioners to begin to consider others for the seat. He explained that this position requires more time than Chairman Sauter is able to give at this time.

The frequency of the Commission meetings was discussed and Vice-Chairman Michelman suggested that the Commission meet once a month or every six weeks. He explained that it is often difficult to address all of the issues at hand in one meeting and discuss the matters that need attention. It was agreed that the next meeting will be held in Irvine at the City Hall on August 14, 2003 and that the following meeting will be September 18, 2003 at a venue to be determined.

## **18. PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

Mr. Denkin suggested that a discussion be made as to the criteria of a technical knockout, knockout and a hard fight.

\*\*\*

The meeting was then adjourned.

The draft minutes were prepared by:

\_\_\_\_\_

June 26, 2003

\_\_\_\_\_

JESSICA FINCH

DATE

The final minutes were prepared by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
JESSICA FINCH

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE